DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 208 CE 080 663

AUTHOR	Cohen, Marie
TITLE	Promoting Education among TANF Teens.
INSTITUTION	Welfare Information Network, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, MD.; Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, MI.; David and Lucile Packard Foundation, Los Altos, CA.; Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, New York, NY.; Ford Foundation, New York, NY.; Foundation for Child Development, New York, NY.; Administration for Children and Families (DHHS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1998-12-00
NOTE	14p.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.welfareinfo.org/teensinschool.htm.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Serials (022) -- Information Analyses (070)
JOURNAL CIT	Issue Notes; v2 n17 Dec 1998
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Adult Education; Agency Cooperation; Agency Role; Counseling Services; Dropout Prevention; Early Parenthood; *Education Work Relationship; Educational Counseling; Eligibility; Federal Legislation; Guidelines; One Parent Family; Out of School Youth; *Policy Formation; Public Agencies; *Public Policy; School Holding Power; Secondary Education; Social Science Research; *Welfare Recipients; World Wide Web; *Youth Employment; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Marketing; Personal Responsibility and Work Opp Recon Act; *Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; Welfare Reform; Welfare to Work Programs

ABSTRACT

This document examines issues related to promoting education among teenage recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). The document begins with background information about the provisions of recent federal legislation affecting TANF recipients under age 20. The following are among the 16 policy and management issues considered in Section 2: (1) special services that states should provide to promote education for TANF teens; (2) extension of education requirements and services to TANF teens who are not parents; (3) possible exemption of some teens from education requirements; (4) possible alternatives to traditional schooling that should be allowed and provided; (5) sanctions for noncompliance; (6) possible provision of bonuses for teens who stay in school; (7) ways of monitoring TANF teens' behavior; (8) support services needed by teens in order to attend school; and (9) ways TANF agencies can collaborate with other agencies to encourage school attendance among TANF teens. Section 3 reviews the findings of research about initiatives to encourage school completion among teenage TANF recipients. Section 4 describes 21 innovative practices promoting school completion by teenage TANF recipients (14 involving TANF agencies and 7 involving non-TANF agencies). The bibliography lists 9 resource contacts and 22 publications. (MN)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 208

Promoting Education Among TANF Teens

Welfare Information Network
Issue Notes
Volume 2, no. 17 December 1998

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY:

B. Van Lare

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK **Issue Notes**

Vol. 2, No. 17 December 1998

Promoting Education among TANF Teens

by Marie Cohen

Background

There has been increasing concern about the tendency of children from low-income families to drop out of high school. These children are much more likely to drop out of school than are children from families with higher incomes. School dropout perpetuates the cycle of poverty because people who lack a high school degree have lower earnings and are much more likely to be poor, unemployed, and on welfare. (See National Center for Education Statistics, 1998.)

For some time, there has been an interest among policymakers in using welfare to encourage school attendance. The Family Support Act of 1988 required each state, to the extent that resources were available, to mandate participation in education by non-exempt custodial parents under age 20 on Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) who had dropped out of high school. While the Family Support Act was in force, 28 states obtained federal waivers to their AFDC programs to broaden their school attendance requirements by including teens currently in school or including all teens in AFDC families rather than just those who are custodial parents. This approach of requiring school attendance for students in welfare families has often been called "Learnfare."

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunities Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) replaced AFDC with Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). PRWORA prohibits a state from using any part of its federal TANF grant to fund assistance to anyone who is under 18, is not married, has a child at least 12 weeks old, and does not have a high school degree or equivalent, unless the assistance recipient is in school working toward a high school degree, or in an alternative education or training program that has been approved by the state. States are allowed to drop or continue their waivers and can set any policy they want for teens who are not parents.

PRWORA requires that states involve an increasing proportion of their TANF recipients in work or related activities in order to receive their full TANF allocations. To further encourage states to require teenage parents to attend school, PRWORA provides that a teenage head of household cannot be counted toward these participation requirements unless she is maintaining satisfactory attendance at secondary school or the equivalent, or participates in education directly related to employment for at least 25 hours per week in FY 1999 and 30 hours thereafter.

Policy and Management Issues

There are many decisions to be made about how a state should encourage education for TANF teens. Some of these issues are discussed briefly here. For a more in-depth discussion of these and other issues, see Long and Bos, 1998, and Levin-Epstein, 1996.

The Welfare Information Network — Barry L. Van Lare, Executive Director
A Special Activity of The Finance Project
Tel: 202-628-5790 — Website: www.welfareinfo.org — E-Mail Address: welfinfo@welfareinfo.org

What, if any, special services should the state provide to promote education for TANF teens? While states can rely on requirements alone to promote school attendance among TANF teens, they can also elect to provide services that encourage or support education. Such services might include enhanced case management, tutoring or other supports to help youth succeed in school, or even alternative education programs. Obviously, services are more expensive than requirements alone, but there is some evidence, discussed in the Research Findings section below, that some services alone or combined with requirements may be more effective than requirements alone.

Should the requirements or services be extended to TANF teens that are not parents? PRWORA requires education only for teenage parents on TANF, not for teenage children in TANF families, but many states require school attendance for all minors on TANF. The lack of a high school degree is problematic for anyone, whether or not she had children as a teen. Many teenage parents had struggled in school or already dropped out of school before having children so it might make sense to address these issues earlier. On the other hand, if resources are limited, it may make sense to focus on a more limited group, whether that group is teen mothers or some other subgroup.

Should the state target in-school youth, dropouts, or both? In setting its own requirements for non-parent children and in providing educational services to teens, a state can choose to target in-school youths, dropouts, or both. Both research and experience suggest that it is harder to get dropouts to return to school than to keep youths from dropping out in the first place. In addition, keeping a student in school requires fewer resources than getting a dropout to complete school.

Who, if anyone, should be exempt from education requirements? PRWORA gives states the option to exempt from participation single parents with children under the age of one. However, teen parents must participate in education to receive federal TANF funds. In deciding whether to impose an education requirement on these parents, a state must balance the cost of child care against the foregone federal TANF contribution when a teen is exempted and the benefits of continued education. A longer exemption period means a longer interruption of schooling, which sets teen parents back academically and may increase their risk of dropping out.

What alternatives to traditional schooling should be allowed and provided and who should be eligible? States have the option of deciding what, if any, alternatives to high school are acceptable for TANF teens. It is clear that some teenagers who have already dropped out of school will be unwilling to return to that setting. Dropouts with poor basic skills are particularly unlikely to be willing to return to classrooms with students who are much younger than they are. Some of these teens might prefer alternative high schools or adult education programs leading to attainment of a General Educational Development Certificate (GED). On the other hand, there is some evidence that a high school degree is more valuable in the labor market than a GED (see Cameron and Heckman, 1993). A state must decide whether to disallow GED programs or perhaps use bonuses to encourage high school completion more, as discussed below. States might want to develop alternative high schools that have some of the features that make GED programs attractive, such as flexible scheduling and self-paced activities. Programs, such as Youth Corps and YouthBuild, that provide education integrated with work experience may be attractive to some dropouts. Some teens may be unwilling to engage in any academic program. Options like work experience or vocational training may be more attractive to these teens but the state must weigh the relative risks of letting them "get away" without a high school degree versus losing them altogether if education is required.

What should states do about teen parents who do not participate in any required activity? Some teens have such intense personal problems that even participation in an education or training program might be impossible. Such teens might benefit from home visits, work experience, or

treatment for personal problems such as drug abuse or mental illness before they can be expected to re-enter education or training (Bos and Fellerath, 1997). States cannot use federal funds to assist teen parents who do not participate in a required educational or training activity. They can, however, define education or training as broadly as possible to encompass some of these activities and use their own segregated funds for activities that cannot be included in such a broad definition.

What behaviors should be required? PRWORA forbids assistance to teen parents who do not *participate* in high school or alternative educational activities, but fails to define participation. Attendance, the focus of most learnfare programs, does not ensure that the student is actually investing time and attention in school. A few states require a certain grade point average (GPA) or grade completion, but each of these approaches has drawbacks as well. For example, standard GPAs are not used in some adult education programs and grade completion takes place only once a year. Using more than one performance measure may be advisable (Long and Bos, 1998).

What should the sanction for noncompliance be? The state must decide how much to reduce the family's grant in the case of noncompliance with education requirements. The state must balance the expected efficacy of the sanction against the possible harm to the child of a teenage parent, or other children in the home of a teenager who is not a parent.

Should bonuses be provided for teens who stay in school? What achievements should trigger the bonuses? As MDRC (Long and Bos, 1998) points out, using sanctions for noncompliance with education requirements, without bonuses for compliance, has several drawbacks. It is a negative approach, it takes money away from poor families, and it may not be effective. The achievements to be rewarded must be chosen carefully. MDRC (Bos and Fellerath, 1998) noted that Ohio's LEAP program, which provided bonuses for attendance only, penalized those teens who graduated or obtained a GED, because they could no longer obtain bonuses. MDRC thus recommended, and Ohio implemented, bonuses for measures of academic progress and school completion, such as grade completion, graduation, and GED attainment. States might also want to reward high school completion more than the attainment of a GED, in light of the greater effort required to obtain a high school degree and evidence that it is more valuable in the labor market.

How should behavior be monitored?. Many welfare agencies have had problems getting the information they need to monitor compliance with education requirements from schools or alternative programs (Long and Bos, 1998). MDRC suggests several strategies for overcoming such problems, including using centralized data reporting; monitoring more effectively but less frequently; and focusing on outcomes, such as grades, that may be easier for a state to monitor than attendance.

Who should do the case management? What should their duties be? How high should caseloads be? Case managers are needed both to enforce requirements and to coordinate services. A state's emphasis on requirements as opposed to services will determine the relative importance of various duties, such as monitoring attendance, developing education plans, providing information, counseling, and assisting participants with problems that may interfere with school attendance. A state must choose whether to use TANF eligibility workers or case managers and also whether to use specialized caseworkers for teens. Case managers may be more appropriate in a program that provides services in addition to requirements. Teen specialists have the advantage of being able to develop specialized knowledge about the attendance monitoring system, education, and the problems facing teens. There is no generally accepted caseload size for working with TANF teens. LEAP case managers expressed the opinion that caseloads should be 75 or less if they are to provide assistance beyond basic processing or monitoring (Long and Bos, 1998) but still lower caseloads may be necessary to allow case managers to address the many problems that interfere with school attendance.

What support services do teens need in order to attend school? Requirements without support services are likely to produce only limited increases in school attendance, especially among teen mothers, who at a minimum must have child care. MDRC found that problems like homelessness, domestic violence, illnesses, and breakdown of child care and transportation arrangements contributed to spotty participation in educational programs among participants in the New Chance program, which served teen mothers who had dropped out of high school (Quint, et al., 1997). Policy makers must consider what supports are necessary, as well as what circumstances warrant deferrals or exemptions from school attendance. Child care is particularly important. According to MDRC (Bos and Fellerath, 1997), more teens might stay in school if they were allowed to use the informal sources of child care that many prefer, as opposed to the licensed care required by LEAP. On the other hand, it is important that the children of teenage parents receive child care that promotes their intellectual and social development. School-based child care appears to be attractive to teen parents (Laracy et al., 1994) and also can be designed to be developmentally enriching.

What can be done about the often destructive role of peers and boyfriends? Family members, partners, and peers can discourage a teen's return to school or encourage dropping out (Quint et al., 1997). Neighborhood or family-based interventions and working with non-custodial parents may be effective ways of dealing with such problems.

What should be the role of the welfare, education, and workforce agencies? In most cases, the welfare agency administers sanctions, monitors attendance and provides case management to TANF teens. However, the TANF agency must decide whether it will contract directly for supplemental and supportive services such as tutoring or for employment and training programs, or whether it will rely on services provided by the education and workforce agencies. On one hand, welfare agencies may not be well equipped to supervise education programs; on the other hand, education and workforce agencies may not be providing the services that TANF teens need, while TANF funds may be available to provide such services. If the state does not want the TANF agency to be in the business of education, it can make TANF funds available to education and workforce departments to provide appropriate education and training programs to help TANF teens. The new Workforce Investment Act encourages adoption of "youth development" approaches like integrated academic and vocational education, thus providing a potential source of funding for such programs.

How can the TANF agency collaborate with other agencies to encourage school attendance among TANF teens? Some tasks, such as monitoring and reporting of attendance, require collaboration between the public schools and the TANF agency. Collaboration can be broadened to have education and welfare staff work together at all levels, from policy development to service provision, so that agencies share responsibility for suggesting policy changes and addressing the needs of individual teens. In one instance of collaboration described by MDRC, LEAP case managers were stationed at Cleveland high schools. See Laracy, et al., 1994 for more suggestions for effective collaboration. TANF agencies should also collaborate with child welfare agencies, since data suggest that students who are sanctioned for failing to stay in school frequently are from families known to the child welfare system (see Levin-Epstein, 1996). TANF agencies might want to ensure that child welfare case managers are aware of those families facing sanction for nonattendance in school and can help them comply with school attendance requirements.

How can schools be reformed to prevent dropping out? Many welfare teens attend schools in low-income neighborhoods with large classes, poor resources, and high dropout rates in general, not just for TANF teens. Thus, lowering dropout across the board through reform of low-income schools should be a high priority. The field of education for the disadvantaged is too large to explore here,

here, but readers can contact the U.S. Department of Education's compensatory education office at (202) 260-0826 or see http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA/.

Research Findings

Several initiatives to encourage school completion among TANF teens have been evaluated. Wisconsin's Learnfare program required all AFDC teenagers (not just parents) to regularly attend school or an alternative educational program. The four-state Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD), sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, required teenage parents who were new AFDC recipients to participate in one or more activities, including education, or incur a sanction. Ohio's Learning, Earning and Parenting (LEAP) program offered financial rewards as well as penalties tied to school attendance to teenage parents only. New Chance, which differed from the other initiatives in being voluntary, provided education, training, and other services to young women who had children as teenagers and were high school dropouts. All of the programs offered support services, mainly case management, child care assistance, and transportation assistance.

While evaluations of these initiatives have found some limited success on certain outcomes, none of these programs produced the significant improvements that were hoped for. All of the programs except Learnfare increased participation in education. Both New Chance and LEAP, but not TPD or Learnfare, had statistically significant positive effects on educational attainment, mostly through acquisition of GEDs. The two programs--New Chance and TPD--that measured their impact on literacy had discouraging results: neither showed any effects on literacy, and absolute levels remained low. While the Learnfare evaluation did not look at employment and earnings, two of the other three programs (LEAP and TPD) had statistically significant longer-term impacts on employment for those enrolled in school when they became subject to the program, but none of them had impacts for dropouts. In its synthesis of the LEAP, TPD and New Chance evaluations, MDRC (Granger and Cytron, 1998) concluded that it is easier to influence teens to pursue a GED than a high school diploma. This result is not surprising, since many teen parents are unwilling to return to the schools were they have failed and GED programs tend to be more flexibly scheduled and self-paced.

Other programs *have* had a more positive impact on school attendance and performance by at-risk teens. An enhanced form of LEAP that provided in-school case management significantly increased the probability that teens who attended school regularly graduated or earned a GED (Long, Wood, and Kopp, 1994). The Quantum Opportunities Program provided tutoring, homework assistance, computer-assisted instruction, community service opportunities, other activities and services, and mentors who stayed with students for four years regardless of circumstances. Evaluators (Hahn et al., 1994) found that QOP participants were much more likely to graduate from high school (63% as opposed to 42%) and go to post-secondary school and had higher test scores four years after the beginning of the program. An evaluation of Big Brothers/Big Sisters, a mentoring program, found a significant effect on school attendance, with Little Sisters reporting skipping 84% fewer days of school than members of a randomly selected control group (see Tierney and Grossman, 1995). The Teen Outreach Program combines service learning and classroom activities focused on helping students prepare for the service experience and deal with development tasks and issues. An evaluation (Allen et al., 1997) found a 39% lower rate of course failure and a 42% lower rate of school suspension among program participants than among the controls. The Center for Employment Training, which provides basic education integrated with vocational skills training, has greatly outperformed other sites in two employment and training demonstrations (Cave et al., 1993).

The effects of such voluntary programs may be even better than they seem, because the control groups in these programs are more motivated than the control groups in mandatory programs, and many may seek and find other services. On the other hand, many of these programs are small and we

do not know whether they can retain their effectiveness on a large scale. We must await evidence from programs, like QOP, which are being piloted at multiple sites.

Analysts studying the more effective programs have concluded that they tend to have the following characteristics: adult support, structure and expectations; creative forms of learning; rich connections to the workforce; integration of work and learning; support and follow-up; opportunities for community service; high-quality implementation; financial incentives; frequent opportunities to experience achievement; and early intervention with problems (Long, 1996, American Youth Policy Forum, 1997, Kazis and Kopp, 1997). Many of these elements are part of an evolving approach known as "youth development," which takes into account youths' developmental needs. See WIN's Youth Development web page, *http://www.welfareinfo.org/youth.htm*, for more information.

Innovative Practices

In addition to the federal education requirement for TANF teen parents, many states have imposed education requirements on all teens in TANF families. Preliminary data for 44 states from the State Policy Documentation Project, a joint project of the Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP) and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, shows that all 44 have school requirements for teen parents and 34 states have such requirements for youths who are not parents. Most of these states require attendance only, with a few requiring teens to achieve other outcomes such as grade point average or grade completion. Only seven of the states use bonuses to encourage students to complete school or achieve good grades. The final survey results will be available in early 1999.

In addition to such requirements, many states have programs to keep teens in school or encourage dropouts to continue their education. Some of these initiatives are operated alone or in partnership by TANF agencies; many more are run by education, labor departments or other agencies. Only a few of the many relevant initiatives are listed here. For more innovative programs, see Brown, 1998.

Initiatives with TANF Agency Involvement

A number of state TANF agencies have initiatives, beyond simple requirements, to encourage TANF teens to continue their schooling. Some of these initiatives are run exclusively by TANF agencies, and others are partnerships. These initiatives often include case management and assessment and less often bonuses and special education and training services.

Ohio's LEAP Program includes a $62 monthly bonus for teen parents meeting the attendance requirement and a $62 sanction for those who exceed the allowed number of excused absences. After six consecutive months of sanctions, the entire cash grant for the teen and her children is eliminated. Teens can earn a $62 bonus for the successful completion of a grade level other than 12 and $200 for attaining a high school diploma or GED. LEAP also provides specialized case managers and support services. LEAP builds upon two pre-existing programs for teen parents run by the State Department of Education. GRADS teachers provide instruction and facilitate services to pregnant and parenting teens. GOALS provides special classes to teenage parents who have dropped out. Contact: Jackie Martin, Ohio Department of Human Services, (614) 728-4742.

California's Cal-Learn Program, started in April 1994, is a mandatory statewide program for pregnant teens and teen parents on welfare. The program provides intensive case management (provided through a pre-existing case management program under the Health Department), support services, and fiscal bonuses or sanctions to encourage pregnant and parenting teens to stay in school and obtain a high school diploma or equivalent. See Cunniff, et al., 1997 or contact Tom Burke, California Department of Social Services, (916) 653-3850, *tburke@dss.ca.gov*.

Vermont's Teen Parent Education Program (TPEP) is run by the state TANF agency through the 15 Parent-Child Centers which provide case management services to young parents receiving TANF. TPEP provides a coordinator in each center who develops individual education plans for each teen, coordinates with her TANF case manager, advocates for her with her school, and coordinates her educational program. Educational approaches used range from traditional high school to GED, Adult Basic Education, community college, and other programs. Some programs also fund a part-time educator to provide tutoring or special classes to TPEP participants. Teens receive cash incentives, with a lifetime maximum of $500, for meeting identified educational benchmarks. Contact: Karen Ryder, Department of Social Welfare, *KarenR@wpgate1.ahs.state.vt.us*.

New Hampshire's TANF agency has contracted with the New Hampshire Job Training Council to provide its **Jobs for New Hampshire Graduates** programs to TANF youth enrolled at 22 high schools in the state. In each school, a staff member provides a variety of services to 32 at-risk young people, including elimination of barriers to school completion, instruction in various employment competencies, development of workplace learning opportunities, job development, and follow-up and support for at least a year after graduation. Jobs for New Hampshire Graduates is an affiliate of a national program, Jobs for America's Graduates. Contact Bonnie St. Jean, New Hampshire Job Training Council, (603) 229-3388 or *Bonnie@NHJTC.org*, or see *www.jag.org*.

The Young Parents Program in **Massachusetts** is a 10-year-old program designed to serve pregnant or parenting TANF recipients between the ages of 14 and 22 without a high school diploma or equivalent. Community-based organizations provide assessment and educational activities leading to high school equivalence, as well as life skills and job readiness training, academic and vocational counseling, and placement in jobs and job-related activities for those who attain their GEDs. Contact: Elaine Frawley, Department of Transitional Assistance, (617) 348-5936.

Utah's Central Region Teen Parent Program provides a team of specialized case managers with reduced caseloads who work with teens to encourage them to complete high school and continue with work or training. Peer groups and parenting classes are also provided. Contact: Mary Pannunzio, (801) 468-0063 or *mpannun@state.ut.us*.

Delaware uses contractors to provide **Teen Stay in School/Return to School Services**, including: assessment; development of a parent/student agreement and Individual Personal Development Plan that includes academic remediation, work readiness skills, and career development activities; peer support; mentoring; and summer work experience. Contact: Chip Colvin, Department of Social Services, (302) 577-4880 x. 232 or *ccolvin@state.de.us*.

Rhode Island's Adolescent Self-Sufficiency Collaborative is a statewide network of community organizations serving pregnant and parenting teens, not just those on TANF. It is funded, coordinated and monitored by the Department of Human Services through contractors. Clients receive assessment and case management services to promote the postponement of repeat pregnancies, the establishment of child support and paternity, safe living arrangements, and completion of secondary school. TANF funds provide about half the program's budget. Contact: Pamela Goodwin, Department of Human Services, pgoodwin@gw.dhs.state.ri.us.

Illinois' Teen Parent Services helps TANF parents stay in school, obtain a high school diploma, and achieve economic independence. The program is administered through contracts with youth-serving agencies and operated in parts of the state by special Department of Human Resources teen parent case managers. Services include case management, assessment, educational programs, workshops, and support services. DHS also operates the **Teen REACH program**, which is designed to promote

the school success of children ages 10 to 17 living in high-poverty communities, many of whom are on TANF. The program is funded by several sources, including TANF. All 37 local projects provide academic enrichment, recreational activities, adult mentors, life skills education and parental involvement. Contact: Denise Simon, Illinois Department of Human Resources, (217) 785-0462.

Hawaii uses Child Care and Development Funds to provide child care at five high school campuses. The program was established to support the Grads program of the state Education Department, which encourages teen parents to continue their high school education. Contact: Gail Kikudome, Employment and Child Care Program Office, (808) 586-7050 or *Gkikudom@gte.net*.

New York State's Education for Gainful Employment (EDGE) Program is a partnership between its Departments of Education and Social Services. EDGE uses literacy and TANF funds to provide a combination of education and work experience to TANF recipients. A teen parent initiative added to the program in 1997 combines EDGE funding with vocational education and teen pregnancy funding to serve teen parents who are required to be in school. Contact: Barbara Shay or Robert Purga, Department of Education, (518) 474-8920 or *rpurga@mail.nysed.gov*.

Pennsylvania's ELECT program helps pregnant and parenting teens to stay in school or return to school. The program provides case management, summer programs, and parenting and child development classes. The Department of Education administers the program through an agreement with the Department of Public Welfare, using funds from both agencies, including TANF funds. Local school districts must provide matching funds. Philadelphia's program operates service centers at all of the city's comprehensive high schools and a Saturday school. Contact: David Florey, Pennsylvania Department of Public Welfare, (717) 787-8613; Larry Aniloff, School District of Philadelphia, (215) 875-3829.

Jefferson County, Kentucky's, Neighborhood Places are family resource centers that bring together staff of the schools, welfare department, health department, mental health, drug and alcohol, and other agencies. The Neighborhood Places and their partner agencies have developed a school attendance support plan. Among the highlights of the plan are: the county human services department will fund local churches to work with middle school students at risk for poor attendance; the public schools will provide attendance data to the TANF agency, and all Neighborhood Place staff will include assessment of children's school attendance as part of their case management. Each of the seven local Neighborhood Places has its own plan to support attendance. In addition, the **Jefferson County Public Schools** has developed a computer program to report attendance data to the public assistance office. Contact: Martin Bell, Jefferson County Public Schools, (502) 485-3949.

Some states have contracted with **Youth Corps** to work with TANF youth. Youth Corps participants combine work on environmental or human service projects with education and life skills training. Contact: Andy Moore, National Association of Service and Conservation Corps, (202) 737-6272.

Initiatives by Non-TANF Agencies

School systems, employment and training agencies and youth-serving organizations all have initiatives to keep at-risk teens in school. Under PRWORA's flexibility, states can assign TANF funds to such initiatives or allocate additional state funds to them. Linkages to the workforce, service learning, and mentors are features found in many of these initiatives.

There has been increasing interest in **School to Work** programs, which attempt to link education with careers through education about different careers, work experience, and development of

education and training credentials for specific careers. Such programs could encourage students to stay in school by making school more interesting and making visible its connection to work opportunities. The School-to-Work Opportunities Act provides seed money to states and local partnerships to develop school-to-work systems. Contact: The National School-to-Work Learning & Information Center, *www.stw.ed.gov* or 800-251-7236.

Many local school systems have initiatives to retain at-risk students or encourage dropouts to return to school. A high proportion of these students is often from TANF families. These initiatives often include an open-entry, open exit policy, longer school periods, and nontraditional hours to allow students to work. For example, the **School District of Philadelphia** has special "Twilight Schools" for dropouts that include service learning and employment opportunities, take place at nontraditional hours, operate in ten-week cycles, and provide child care. Students in Transitional Opportunities Promoting Success (TOPS) stay in one classroom with specially trained teachers, who focus on basic skills in individually paced units. Students are also placed in work-based and service learning positions. Contact: Larry Aniloff, School District of Philadelphia, (215) 875-3829. **Jefferson County High School** in Louisville, Kentucky, is an alternative school for youth who have dropped out or are at risk of dropping out. The school is open entry/open exit with flexible schedules and extended school days and school year. It operates 14 hours per day, in three-hour segments and at multiple locations. Contact: M. Buell Snyder, (502) 485-3173.

The **Quantum Opportunities Program (QOP)** is a very intensive intervention combining educational assistance, community service opportunities, and case managers who serve as mentors for disadvantaged youth. Participants are expected to spend 750 hours annually in QOP activities. Case managers have an average caseload of less than 20 participants. Results of an earlier evaluation, described above, were quite strong. The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) and the Ford Foundation are funding a multi-site replication and evaluation of the program. Contact: Eileen Pederson, U.S. Department of Labor, (202) 219-5782, ext. 145.

I Have a Dream programs, sponsored by individuals and groups, combine guaranteed college tuition with mentoring, after-school, and summer programs to groups of sixth-graders in disadvantaged communities around the country. Nationally, between 60% and 80% of Dreamers graduate from high school, as compared to the rate of less that 50% that is expected in their schools. Contact: Joseph Arnow, I Have a Dream Foundation, (212) 775-5800.

Big Brothers/Big Sisters provides mentors for over 100,000 children and youth in all states. Mentors and youths meet several hours per week for at least a year. Applicants are carefully screened before being matched with clients. Case managers maintain constant contact with mentors, youth, and their families. As mentioned above, an evaluation showed strong effects on school attendance and other outcomes. Contact BBBS of America, (215) 567-7000, or *www.bbbsa.org*.

The **Teen Outreach Program** combines supervised community service with classroom discussions. In the classroom, teens explore their values and relationships and develop life skills such as communications, decision making and goal setting. An evaluation found the program significantly decreased course failure and suspension. Contact: Cornerstone Consulting Group, (713) 627-2322.

The **Center for Employment Training** has far outperformed other sites in two employment and training demonstrations, as mentioned above. CET provides integrated education and training, a clear focus on employment as the program goal, relatively intensive services concentrated in a short time period, training for job skills that are in demand in the labor market, and an open entry, open exit approach. The U.S. Department of Labor is conducting a national evaluation of CET. See

http://www.best.com/~cfet/main.htm or call the headquarters at (408) 287-7924. For information on the evaluation, contact David Lah, U.S. Department of Labor, (202) 219-5782, ext. 105.

For More Information . . .

RESOURCE CONTACTS

Abt Associates, David Long, (301) 718-3154.

The American Youth Policy Forum, Samuel Halpern, (202) 775-9731.

The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP), Jodie Levin-Epstein, (202) 328-5174, *jodie@clasp.org*; Julie Strawn, (202) 797-6536 or *jstrawn@clasp.org*.

Jobs for the Future, (617) 728-4446 or *www.jff.org*.

Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, Johannes Bos, (415) 781-3800 or *hbos@mdrcsf.org*.

Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., Rebecca Maynard, (609) 799-3535.

National Youth Employment Coalition, David Brown, (202) 659-1064.

Public/Private Ventures, (215) 557-4400, *http://www.epn.org/ppv/*.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: Office of Family Assistance: Mack Storrs, (202) 401-9289; Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation: Reuben Snipper (TANF), 202-401-6615, and Emily Novick (youth), 202-690-5937 .

PUBLICATIONS

Allen, Joseph P. et al., "Preventing Teen Pregnancy and Academic Failure: Experimental Evaluation of a Developmentally-based Approach." *Child Development,* Vol. 64, No. 4. (914) 626-2126.

American Youth Policy Forum, *Some Things DO Make a Difference for Youth.* Washington, DC: 1997. Send $10.00 to AYPF, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 719, Washington, DC 20036. (A second volume is forthcoming.)

Batten, Susan and Bonita Stowell, *School-Based Programs for Adolescent Parents and Their Young Children: Guidelines for Quality and Best Practice.* Bala Cynwyd, PA: Center for Assessment and Policy Development, Oct. 1996. (610) 664-4540.

Bos, Johannes M., and Veronica Fellerath, *Final Report on Ohio's Welfare Initiative to Improve School Attendance Among Teenage Parents: Ohio's Learning, Earning and Parenting Program.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1997. *www.mdrc.org*.

Brown, David, *Preparing Youth for the Workforce under Welfare Reform.* Washington, DC: National Governors' Association, July 1998.
http://www.nga.org/Pubs/IssueBriefs/1998/980728Youth.asp

Cameron, Stephen, and James Heckman, "The Nonequivalence of High School Equivalents." *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 1993.

Cave, George, et al., *Jobstart: Final Report on a Program for School Dropouts.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, October 1993. (212) 532-3200.

Cunniff, James, et al., *Implementation of California's Cal-Learn Demonstration Project: A Process Evaluation.* Berkeley, CA: UC Data, 1997. *Http://ucdata.berkeley.edu/.*

Granger, Robert and Rachel Cytron, *Teenage Parent Programs: A Synthesis of the Long-Term Effects of the New Chance Demonstration, Ohio's Learning, Earning and Parenting (LEAP) Program, and the Teenage Parent Demonstration (TPD).* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, June 1998. See *www.mdrc.org.*

Hahn, Andrew, et al., *Evaluation of the Quantum Opportunities Program: Did the Program Work?* Waltham, MA: Brandeis University, 1994. (800) 343-4705.

Kisker, Ellen, Anu Rangarajan, and Kimberly Boller, *Moving into Adulthood: Were the Impacts of Mandatory Programs for Welfare-Dependent Teenaged Parents Sustained After the Programs Ended?* Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., February 1998. Executive summary available at *http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/hsp/isp/tpd/folup2/index.htm*

Laracy, Michael, Jodie Levin-Epstein and Carolyn Shapiro, *Learning to Work Together: How Education and Welfare Agencies Can Coordinate Schooling/Training of AFDC Teen Parents.* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy, October 1994. (202) 328-5140.

Levin-Epstein, Jodie, *Teen Parent Provisions in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Law and Social Policy, 1996. *http://epn.org/clasp/pdf/teen.pdf*

Long, David and Johannes M. Bos, *Learnfare: How to Implement a Mandatory Stay-in-School Program for Teenage Parents on Welfare.* New York: MDRC, 1998. (212) 532-3200

Long, David, *What Works? Evidence from Evaluation Research on Programs for Disadvantaged Youths in the United States.* Prepared for Human Resources Development Canada, May 1996. Contact David Long at (301) 718-3154.

Maynard, Rebecca, Walter Nicholson, and Anu Rangarajan, *Breaking the Cycle of Poverty: The Effectiveness of Mandatory Services for Welfare-Dependent Teenage Parents.* Princeton, N.J.: Mathematica Policy Research, 1993. (609) 275-2350

Quint, Janet, Johannes M. Bos, and Denise Polit, *New Chance: Final Report on a Comprehensive Program for Young Mothers in Poverty and their Children.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1997. (212) 532-3200.

Research Forum on Children, Families, and the New Federalism, "Teen Parent Program EvaluationsYield No Simple Answer." *The Forum,* December 1998. (212) 304-7150.

State of Wisconsin Legislative Audit Bureau, *An Evaluation of the Learnfare Program: Final Report.* Madison: 1997. (608) 266-2818.

Tierney, Joseph, et al., *Making a Difference: An Impact Study of Big Brothers Big Sisters.* Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures, 1995. (215) 557-4400.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education 1998.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1998. *http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=98013*

Wood, Robert and John Burghardt, *Implementing Welfare Reform Requirements for Teenage Parents: Lessons from Experience in Four States.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, October 31, 1997. *http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/hsp/isp/teepareq/front.htm*

The author wishes to thank the many people and organizations who contributed information and comments, especially Hans Bos, David Brown, Jodie Levin-Epstein, David Long, Lisa Plimpton, and Jessica Yates. WIN also thanks the Center for Law and Social Policy and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities for sharing their preliminary survey data.

The Welfare Information Network is supported by grants from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, the David and Lucile Packard Foundation, the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Foundation for Child Development, the McKnight Foundation, and the Administration for Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

WELFARE INFORMATION NETWORK

1000 Vermont Ave., NW - Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005